

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/730,300	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GAYDOS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Andre' L. Jackson	<b>Art Unit</b> 3677	

**All Participants:**

(1) Andre' L. Jackson.

(2) John Harbst.
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 22 August 2005
**Time:** 11:00 a.m.
**Type of Interview:**
☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**
**Rejection(s) discussed:**

N/A

**Claims discussed:**

8

**Prior art documents discussed:**

N/A

**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Andre' L. Jackson 8/22/05  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted John Harbst to discuss a proposed amendment to claim 8 which will satisfy patentability of the application and place in condition for allowance. In particular, applicant's "whereby clause" is suggested to be amended to further define the "universal adapter" as mounting with differently formed mounting brackets on a railcar to include a more descriptive passage of how the "universal adapter" defines over the prior art. Mr. Harbst took into consideration the Examiner's proposed amendment and discussed this viewpoint with the applicant. After consultation between applicant and Mr. Harbst, Mr. Harbst suggested an alternate proposal to claim 8 that would include a similar descriptive distinction over the prior art in a more non-limiting manner as compared to the Examiner proposal. Mr. Harbst's proposal was reviewed and considered by the Examiner and an additional Primary Examiner to be satisfactory to the proposed changes and other minor changes needed in the claims by the Examiner, which will be executed by Examiner's Amendment.